HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

Volume XII, No. 24 | Saturday, June 11, 1955 | Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

The Labor Story: "Reuther has been in bed only two or three hours a night for the past two weeks. He is living on excitement. The UAW Chief enjoys nothing so much as making monkeys out of employers." So wrote a veteran Detroit editor several days before Ford knuckled under to the United Auto Workers.

During the negotiations, Detroit's press association reporters — who believed what they wrote — sent out stories that "The situation is tense; a strike seems inevitable." But the two or three labor reporters closest to Reuther were sending out stories all along that "The battle is over. The discussions are merely over the terms of Ford's surrender."

To his intimates, Reuther never concealed his certainty that he would get the principle of the guaranteed annual wage (GAW) from Henry Ford II, whom he picked as the weakling among the motor producers. He tested General Motors in 1945-6; it took a 113-day strike then and he feared the big corporation might stand up to him again.

Reuther talked tough to the Ford negotiators. He warned that three decades ago the decline of the great company, Willys-Overland, began after a crippling strike. He reminded Ford that for a time Chrysler looked as if it might replace Ford as the No. 2 producer, but the 102-day strike against Chrysler in 1950 ended that possibility.

Ford, although in a strong financial position in 1949, had cracked then on pensions and Reuther felt certain Ford would crack on GAW.

The young Ford was especially susceptible since he obviously wants the approval of "liberals." He turned over the management of the half-billion dollar Ford Foundation and its offspring, the Fund for the Republic, to a collection of ADA sympathizers. (Clifford Case was President of the Fund for the Republic until he resigned to run for the Senate from New Jersey. He was succeeded by Robert Hutchins; Elmer Davis is one of its consultants.)

Having gotten his agreement from Ford, Reuther now is going after General Motors and he says "General Motors can afford to pay more, therefore they must give us a better deal." He confides that his plan all along was to get the "principle" from Ford and "the money" from General Motors. Should General Motors make a better deal, the Reuther strategy then is to forget the "ability to pay" argument and demand "the same pay for the same work" from all other employers dealing with UAW.

(Very likely, of course, the settlement terms won by Reuther will run into trouble as they collide with the unemployment benefit laws of about 20 states, including Michigan. But, the little labor leader has won the "principle" of the GAW, has achieved the beginning of a guaranteed annual wage system.)

Since the settlement with Reuther, Ford has been approvingly hailed as a "traitor to his class" — by columnists who follow the ADA-CIO-New Deal line. Classical economists, with whom we have talked, argue the contrary. Ford is, if anything, protecting the interests of the super-rich. They reason as follows: The Big Two in the motor industry are not likely to lose by the spread of GAW. What they will lose in its extra costs will be offset by the long-term erosion of their smaller rivals and by the fact that GAW, when in full force, will make it virtually impossible for up-and-coming talented youngsters to create new motor producing companies.

Businessmen who make the type of concessions to the Reuthers and Becks, that reduce the chances for the "have-nots" to become "haves," are traitors — so say the classical economists. But they are traitors, not to their fellow-tycoons, but to the free enterprise system that has made it possible for a creative genius like Henry Ford II's grandfather to start from scratch and to make a billion dollars — putting millions of automobiles on the highways of the world.

The best legal and political expert on labor-employer relations in the country summed up the events of the past week in an exclusive interview with HUMAN EVENTS as we went to press. Donald R. Richberg, former general counsel of the NRA, former attorney for railway labor unions, Professor of Law at the University of Virginia and member of the law firm of Davies, Richberg, Tydings, Beebe and Landa remarked:

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"It appears to be another combination of Big Business and Big Labor to establish an economic system which bodes ill for competitive businessmen, for small and medium business, and in the last analysis for the consumer, who will — of course — have to foot the bill."

What They Talk About In The Capital: Among GOP observers — but very privately — there is a new wave of pessimism about Ike's chances if he runs. For several months, these observers, most of them, have held "he's a shoo-in." Now, after soundings in various key states, there's a more respectful spirit towards the Democratic Party's claims for '56 victory, based on election statistics. A newly-elected President, whose party loses both houses of Congress in the first off-year election — that's unprecedented. And how will Ike win the big-city states? Without them, he can't win. All the soundings indicate that the McCarthy-ite split has wrought fatal wounds — that the followers of Joe, who gave Ike the margin of victory in '52 will either stay at home or vote Democrat (they were traditionally Democrats anyway.)

In the Capital, they mention the GOP $25-a-plate supper of two weeks ago here, held as a "kick-off" for the draft-Ike movement. It did not go too well. According to one story around the town, they had to bring Ike in (after phone calls to the White House) as an unscheduled speaker — to inspirit the gathering.

● On the other hand, the Democrats are very worried about a candidate. Although the pundits talk Stevenson — there's widespread dissatisfaction. The politicos fear another North-South split if Stevenson or Harriman is the candidate. Yet, they do not dare talk of Lausche or Shivers; they fear the reactions of the Northern liberal-labor, "lib-lab" element. That's why Symington — a possible compromise — isn't yet ruled out. That's why, many Democrats keep looking toward Tammany Boss Carmine DeSapio as the arbiter and magic-worker who could, it is hoped, produce a candidate out of his hat. Noted is the full-length piece on DeSapio in a recent issue of *Life* — part of a publicity build-up for the key figure.

● Stock Market: in the Capital, they look for another bullish wave, based on the optimistic statistics for car-loadings, finances, etc., and expectation that the big institutional funds will come back into the market. But, also, the Capital has its fingers crossed about how long the upswing will last. Here, they figure that the Administration wants to save the big bull market for the election year; they can't have another this year and then a third, in addition, next year. The economics of the situation would not support it. And — wouldn't it be a sorry day, if, in the spring of '56, the Administration would have to check inflation by raising the re-discount rate, with all the perils of a deflationary reaction when the votes are being solicited?

● Realists on diplomatic row think that, from the Western standpoint, Khrushchev did not do so badly for himself during his visit to Tito in Belgrade. He had to eat some crow, but he got Tito to adhere to the "neutralist" line and oppose American policy in the Far East.

Dateline: Prince Edward County: From the locality in which the "integration" law has been first challenged (see June 4 News Section of HUMAN EVENTS) we learn from a special correspondent the following:

Prince Edward County, Va., by — in effect — withdrawing from the operation of schools for the next school term, has perhaps started a new era in the field of American education. The issue now is "operation of private schools" — how to do it? The whole situation is in a state of flux, but the above is the initial trend of thinking of the residents. An effort is being made to pledge several hundred thousand dollars to pave the way for private operation of schools. But also, there is an alternative method spontaneously proposed to underwrite such a new system: money put up as an equivalent for the amount of taxes paid by parents for the maintenance of the public schools. This smacks of the proposal put forward by Frank Chodorov in an article in HUMAN EVENTS of a year ago, "A Solution of Our Public School Problem," May 19, 1954 — "remission to parents of the taxes they are compelled to pay to support" the state schools, so that these parents can pay for private schooling.

Already, this thinking and exploration — private schools instead of public — have established a certain assumption: if the county goes into the private school system, the schools will be operated perforce on a much more economical basis than for many years.

All of the "gingerbread" and "trimmings," so costly in the past — the traffic safety classes, forums on the UN, domestic science discussions, etc. — will be eliminated, and a reversion to the traditional norm of education will take place.

There will then be no necessity of asking the current burning question — "Can Johnny Read?" Johnny, in the new dispensation, will be able to read, because that is the way he will spend his time — on that and Writin' and 'Rithmetic.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another interesting aspect of the situation in Prince Edward County is the new role of the Parent Teachers Association. Instead — like other PTA's throughout the country — of devoting time to passing resolutions for Federal Control of Education, the local PTA is working overtime to consider ways and means for attaining quite the opposite objective — establishing a privately backed and locally controlled school system.

New Boondoggle: IFC is a new set of initials in Washington. It stands for International Finance Corporation, which the Eisenhower Administration has asked the Congress to approve. The IFC is to be set up as a completely controlled World Bank subsidiary. *De facto*, IFC will be merely a new department of the World Bank, making equity-type investments in private and semi-private businesses in underdeveloped countries. IFC will be equipped at the start with $100,000,000, some $35,000,000 of it contributed by the U.S. And IFC will be empowered to sell its debentures in Wall Street and elsewhere.

It is interesting and significant that, when the original IFC proposal was made by the World Bank and endorsed by the UN, the Truman Administration gave it a cold shoulder because it meant putting Government into businesses abroad. Today, by contrast, the Eisenhower Administration, widely regarded as "business-minded," is backing the IFC. However, an important business body, the National Foreign Trade Council, strongly opposes IFC. The NFTC calls the IFC "wrong in principle;" says that industrial development should be left to private enterprise using private funds, which — it adds — are available where conditions justify. NFTC sees no need for "yet another international financial institution."

It was on the occasion of the 1954 Rio Conference that Secretary Humphrey announced that the U.S. would support a revised IFC. This was to stay the clamor of the Latin-Americans for their pipe dream of an Inter-American Bank. But the NFTC says of the revision Humphrey announced: "No substantive change has been made;" that IFC will still provide risk capital. "It is contrary to our established beliefs . . . for a public institution . . . to engage in risk financing of business ventures," says the NFTC.

Military Spendthrifts: On May 3, the Associated Press quoted Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson as saying: "The history of the world is that if you listen to the military people only [re: the supplies they need] they will bankrupt the nation or else create a military dictatorship. That is why our Constitution says that civilians should say how big the armed forces should be." The colossal waste of the military, as revealed by the Hoover Commission, gives point to the words of Secretary Wilson.

In 1951 the Army bought 875,000 pounds of tomatoes in California and shipped them to New York. At the same time the Navy bought nearly 800,000 pounds of tomatoes on the Atlantic Coast and shipped them to California.

The Defense Department now has on hand about *three billion dollars' worth* of clothing that it can't use. That is bad enough — but there is an extra bite to this waste. It is costing the government *thirty-three million dollars a year* in interest and storage charges on the excess clothing.

The Navy has a 72-year supply of canned chicken and some 60-years' supply of ketchup. The Navy's 60-year supply of hamburgers is now the gossip of school children. But there is an interesting phase of this extravagance which somehow has been lost sight of.

> **The 60-years' supply of hamburgers was located in a supply depot, in New Orleans. An Assistant Defense Secretary, confronted with the find, replied that it must be wrong because that depot had been abolished. Apparently he did not know that there was another Army depot there which was housing the hamburgers. That second depot had simply become lost in the Pentagon records!**

The gigantic scope of present military procurement — a scope that seemingly defies even accurate inventories — recalls Kravchenko's story in his book *I Chose Freedom.*

Leaving a Russian village where the people were starving for want of grain, he observed near the railroad station a big red barn some distance down the road. Taking time to investigate he found the barn full of grain — a depot that had simply become lost in the huge bureaucratic system of Moscow.

Indoctrination and Civil Defense: A proposed emergency civilian defense plan has been developed under the sponsorship of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Parent Teachers Association (Md.). The plan itself is less interesting than the fact that it includes a generous dose of propaganda for internationalism.

More than one quarter of the document is a reprint of a speech of Dr. Charles Malik, Minister of Lebanon, to the fourth session of the UN Assembly. First, the Lebanese pundit writes the customary disclaimer about having any sympathy with Communism or the Soviet regime. Then he says that "no one can fail to admire the magnificent achievements of the Soviet State." He points out that "it has, in thirty years and despite two terrific wars, set one sixth of the globe, hitherto exceedingly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

backward, on the sure path of industrialization" — going on to say that the care "the Soviet Union lavishes on its children is certainly exemplary" and that every individual in Russia is encouraged to rise to the top "of the social scale" for "the benefit of society as a whole."

Malik then gets in the big plug for the World State by saying that "in a world bitterly divided by national, racial and cultural antagonisms, the multi-national, multi-racial, multi-cultural *super-state* is a novel mode of political organization holding forth great possibilities for the future."

Then the doctor tells us: "There are many phases of Western life which are repulsively materialistic. The spirit of business and gain, the maddening variety of things exciting your concupiscence (lust), the utter selfishness of uncoordinated activity, all this is *not* something to attract or admire." He concludes that "there is little to choose between the soulless materialism of the West and the militant materialism of the East" and that "the leadership of the West in general does not seem to be adequate to the unprecedented challenges of the age."

Malik's "utter selfishness of uncoordinated activity" is identifiable as the straight Marxist line and his cracks about "business gain" and "concupiscence" comes from one whose part of the world produced the greatest sybaritic and commercially cunning civilizations in history.

New Davy Crockett: The Women's National Press Club in Washington, in its recent annual dinner and stunt show, unveiled a political parody on Davy Crockett and let a Tennessee gal sing something called "Coonskin Estes." It contained the following, "I've got a new gimmick now in my pocket, I'm the 1956 Davy Crockett," thereby celebrating the virtues of perpetual candidate Senator Estes Kefauver.

At the men's Press Club, always ready to rib the gals, the lyric brought retorts, among them a satire in the same vein on Estes:

Back in the Days when our country was young,
Of Davy Crockett the people sung,
Brave and just, a man without fear,
He was the king of the wild frontier.

Now we got some phonies a-trading on your name,
Trying to get elected off'n Davy's fame,
They never shot a 'bar'; they never climbed a tree,
The only raid they ever led was on the Treasury.

In your coonskin cap they go marching about,
Drumming up votes with a promised handout, etc.

Davy, Davy Crockett—Good thing you have died.
Davy, Davy Crockett—This would hurt your pride.

Between Covers: A scholarly treatise, well documented from legal authorities, on the Bricker Amendment controversy is *Treaties Versus the Constitution*, an 88-page book by Roger Lea MacBride, Caxton Printers, Caldwell, Idaho. Price $1. MacBride wrote *The American Electoral College* (1953), also for Caxton Printers, a study of methods for reforming our electoral system. In this new book, MacBride strongly supports the Bricker case.

● Frank Holman, past President of the American Bar Association, brings up to date his crusading arguments for the Bricker fight, in a pamphlet with the title of "The Increasing Need for a Constitutional Amendment on Treaties and Executive Agreements;" available by writing Mr. Holman, Hoge Building, Seattle, Washington.

● Radio interview by Dean Clarence E. Manion of Frank Holman, at the Manion Forum of Opinion, South Bend, Indiana. Subject: Treaty Law and the Bricker Amendment.

● John T. Flynn authors a new pamphlet "Betrayal At Yalta," gotten out by America's Future, Inc., 208 East 43rd Street, New York 17, N. Y. Two copies $.25.

● Debunking the United Nations — is the task well accomplished by Alice Widener in a book *Behind the UN Front*, published by the Bookmailer (Box 101, New York 16, N. Y.) Price, $2.00.

● "Capitalist Counterattack" by Major L. L. B. Angas is a bundle of dynamite put out in booklet form by the author at 280 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. Price, $1.00. This "challenge to leftist intellectuals" contains "an Armory of Answers to the 30 Socialist slogans."

● Speech of the week on State Right to Work Laws, by J. C. Gibson, Vice President and General Counsel of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway System, given at the annual meeting of the National Industrial Conference Board.

Letter from WILLIAM STARR MYERS, Professor of Politics, Princeton University: "I have subscribed to HUMAN EVENTS from the beginning of its publication. I read it regularly and look upon it as indispensable. It gives accurate, first hand information and I rely upon it for the same, and find it never lets me down."

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor, and taxes. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1955.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1. Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3. By first class mail, $11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $12 a year; airmail, $18. Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address. Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. 1954 volume now ready.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XII, No. 24 HUMAN EVENTS June 11, 1955

Article Section

BOOK BURNING

How The Librarians Do It

By VICTOR LASKY

DIVERSE, INDEED, are the ways of the book-burners.

In Milton, Mass., for example, the town librarian refused to buy Eugene W. Castle's book *Billions, Blunders and Baloney.* She explained that it was "a sporadic attack with inaccuracies and written with assumption."

Castle's assumption, based on several years of personal observations abroad, was that U.S. foreign aid and overseas propaganda do us more harm than good.

Admittedly, that is a controversial assumption.

But so is Elmer Davis' *But We Were Born Free,* which can be found in the Milton library. Apparently, the librarian accepts its basic assumption — that American freedoms are rapidly disappearing under the whiplash of McCarthyism.

But there are those in Milton, whose taxes support the library, who would disagree. Yet, no one questions the librarian's right to purchase the Elmer Davis book.

Or, for that matter, the recent penny dreadful by the brothers Alsop, denouncing Admiral Strauss as the villain in the Oppenheimer case, which was criticized even by the physicist himself for intemperateness.

The librarian's charge of inaccuracies hardly holds water since only recently the Milton library obtained a copy of Justice William O. Douglas' highly-inaccurate *Almanac of Democracy.* In it, Douglas said 58,000 court-approved wiretaps had taken place in New York; the correct figure was under 800.

Yet, despite her aversion to inaccuracies, the Milton librarian has not consigned the Douglas book to the furnace.

In itself, Milton's ban on the Castle book is not too important. Whether or not the book is good or bad, accurate or inaccurate, is of no importance, either.

The real issue is whether librarians should be permitted to purchase books solely on the basis of their personal opinions. Are they entitled to ban books not conforming with their ideological predilections?

If they are, then the American Library Association was absolutely right when, in 1943, it endorsed a statement proclaiming that "the freedom to read is in danger."

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The proclamation denounced attempts to list books and authors as "objectionable" or "controversial" and efforts "to remove books from sale, to censor textbooks. . . ."

Noble sentiments, indeed. But they overlook the fact that, quite often, librarians themselves "burn" books. As at Milton, they just don't buy books they don't like.

Sometimes the librarians can't help themselves. For example, in Teaneck, New Jersey, the chief librarian had decided against purchasing the Castle book since the reviews, she claimed, were "bad."

But, as she told a librarians' conference, she had a painful problem: what should she do about the unusual number of requests for the Castle book?

To the untutored, the answer would appear obvious. Give the public what it wants. Or, at least, the librarian should have read the book giving her such pain. But she had not. She told Mr. Castle her opinion of it was based solely on the reviews.

Eventually, her painful dilemma was resolved. She ordered the Castle book.

IT SHOULD BE emphasized that, as in Teaneck, many librarians may be unaware that, by refusing to purchase a book because of certain reviews, they're unwitting accessories in the crime of "book-burning."

More than 12,000 books are published annually. Obviously, few librarians can read more than a handful. Obviously, too, few libraries can purchase every book.

Most librarians, therefore, rely on certain publications for guidance on what to purchase.

Rarely do they decide on the basis of public demand. The Castle book, for example, stirred up extraordinarily large requests in the nation's libraries, to judge from a sampling. Yet, as Boston's chief librarian admits, such demand is no determining influence.

Neither, the Bostonian said, is the fact that a book, such as Castle's, hit national best-seller lists of both the *New York Times* and the *Herald Tribune.*

What is important are the reviews appearing in the *Times* Sunday Book Sections and such trade sources as *The Library Journal* and the Virginia Kirkus tip sheet.

Miss Kirkus' ideological predilections can be seen in her attack on the new Ralph de Toledano anti-Communist novel for failing to contribute to international understanding. Apparently this means that anti-Red manuscripts should be submitted to the Kremlin for approval.

Books like *Billions, Blunders and Baloney* rarely meet with Miss Kirkus' acceptance. In the *Times,* the Castle book was subjected to a hatchet job, more vindictive than usual. The *Library Journal* also denounced the book.

THE JOURNAL, since it caters specifically to librarians, has an enormous say over what Americans find in their libraries. Unfortunately, its recommendations generally are questionable.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

John Caldwell, a writer on the Far East, studied the *Journal's* choices in his field. Invariably, he told a Senate Committee last year, books critical of the Chinese Nationalists are touted. Anti-Communist books, he said, such as Geraldine Fitch's *Formosa Beachhead,* either are condemned or ignored. Books sympathetic with Congressional probes, such as Burnham's *Web of Subversion,* are rarely recommended. Unsurprisingly, therefore, the *Journal* described the Castle book as "an intemperate attack, often bordering on the hysterical . . . unfortunate . . . noisy manner of presentation. . . ."

Librarians were advised to "await demand," meaning they should keep Castle out of their libraries unless the demand was overwhelming.

By giving such advice, the *Journal* has arrogated for itself the powers of a censor. If anyone else presumed to tell librarians what not to buy, the *Journal* undoubtedly would accuse him of "book-burning."

The *Journal's* influence is enormous, according to Boston's chief librarian John M. Carroll. In order to accommodate local tastes, Boston's library system supplements the trade papers with its own reading system.

This consists of "five representative branch librarians, advised by ministers and other community leaders," Mr. Carroll said. The committee decides on a book's merits — or lack of them — on the basis of trade reviews, as well as one submitted by a local reader. The committee's analysis then is sent to the various branch libraries.

Here's what was sent out on *Billions, Blunders and Baloney.*

> "This book is subtitled 'The fantastic story of how Uncle Sam is squandering your money overseas.' It might be well to note that the emphasis in this statement should be on the word 'fantastic.' If Mr. Castle had been a bit less fantastic and a bit more factual his book would have carried greater weight. In this sound and fury treatment he pulls no punches and is impartial in his criticism from the President down.
>
> "Before deciding to buy this item, it might be well to read the following reviews: *New York Times* Book Review, February 13, p. 22; *New York Herald Tribune* Book Review, February 20, p. 5; *Saturday Review,* February 26, p. 14.
>
> "An important subject not too adroitly handled. Undoubtedly there will be calls for this title; in fact there have already been many calls, but buy with caution. Not for replacement."

Mr. Carroll frankly admitted this comment was "not designed to encourage purchase of the book." He said it was not unusual to cite reviews appearing in the two New York newspapers.

Mr. Carroll was unaware that New England's best-known newsman, the *Boston Herald's* Bill Cunningham, had devoted a Sunday column of some 4,000 words to high praise of the Castle book. Or that both the *Boston Globe* and *Boston Post* had warmly recommended the book.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Local newspaper appraisals generally are not profound," Mr. Carroll explained. "Moreover, we seek guidance in non-commercial sources."

The fact that, as reported by the library itself, "there have already been many calls" for the Castle book was unimportant.

"This occurs from time to time," he said. "A newspaper will refer to a book, or Walter Winchell might mention it, and there is phenomenal interest. Which is what happened in the case of Castle. Librarians know what the public wants to read. We seek to avoid deadwood, books not likely to have permanent value."

Mr. Carroll voiced bewilderment in the interest shown in the circular carrying comment on the Castle book. "After all," he said, "we can't read everything."

THAT, OF COURSE, is not the issue.

The issue concerns the objectivity of those empowered to recommend books. In Boston, at least, that objectivity is questionable. Consider the Boston analysis of Emily Hahn's sympathetic biography of Chiang Kai-chek. This recent book was described as "designed for the China Lobby appeal. . . . Not all readers will agree with her interpretation. . . . There will be a demand, but it is not a first choice. . . . A more unbiased interpretation may be forthcoming."

The clichéd phraseology clearly reveals the leftward thinking of those who have a lot to say about what is purchased by Boston libraries.

Obviously the hoped-for "more unbiased interpretation" of Chiang's life would be the traditional one picturing the Gismo as a scoundrel. However, Edwin O. Reischauer's *Wanted — An Asian Policy* was recommended. In urging eventual recognition of Red China, this book takes the Lattimore line.

As stated, the merits of these books are not the issue.

The real issue is whether librarians should be permitted to put their own form of "thought control" over on the American people.

And, whether those in high places, from the White House down, will take cognizance of this form of insidious "book-burning" as they did so forthrightly when a Wisconsin Senator sought to remove Communist books from U.S. overseas propaganda libraries.

Victor Lasky, co-author of *Seeds of Treason,* edited *The American Legion Reader.* His last article for HUMAN EVENTS was "The Facts About Facts Forum" on July 14, 1954.

Letter from FREDERIC NELSON, Associate Editor, *Saturday Evening Post:* "HUMAN EVENTS is so full of brand new information and points of view which are not often expressed in the conventional press that an editorial writer is constantly tempted to picking and stealing. I don't know of any better pipeline to have in Washington than Frank Hanighen."

Additional Copies of the 4-page Article: 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $15; 1,000 for $25. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

HUMAN EVENTS, published at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news-section and a 4-page article. $10 per year. *Trial subscription for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED